arXiv:1611.07820v1 [math-ph] 23 Nov 2016

Local variational study of 2d lattice energies and application to Lennard-Jones type interactions

Laurent Bétermin*

Institut für Angewandte Mathematik,
Interdisciplinary Center for Scientific Computing (IWR),
Universität Heidelberg
Im Neuenheimer Feld 205,
69120 Heidelberg, Germany

November 24, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we focus on finite Bravais lattice energies per point in two dimensions. We compute the first and second derivatives of these energies. We prove that the Hessian at the square and the triangular lattice are diagonal and we give simple sufficient conditions for the local minimality of these lattices. Furthermore, we apply our result to Lennard-Jones type interacting potentials in order to complete our previous works [Commun. Contemp. Math., 17(6):1450049, 2015] and [SIAM J. Math. Anal., 48(5):3236-3269,2016]. We find the maximal open set for the areas of the primitive cell for which the square and the triangular lattice are local maximizers, local minimizers or saddle points. Finally, we present a complete conjecture, based on numerical investigations and rigorous results among rhombic and rectangular lattices, for the minimality of the classical Lennard-Jones energy per point with respect to its area. In particular, we prove that the minimizer is a rectangular lattice if the area is enough large.

AMS Classification: Primary 82B20; Secondary 52C15, 35Q40
Keywords: Lattice energy; Theta functions; Triangular lattice; Crystallization; Interaction potentials; Lennard-Jones potential; Ground state; Local minimum.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Minimization at high and low densities: our previous works 2
1.2 Main results about the local minimality of square and triangular lattices 3
1.3 Conjecture for the classical Lennard-Jones potential 5

2 Lattices, parametrization and energies **6**
2.1 Lattice parametrization and general energy 6
2.2 Rhombic and rectangular lattices 8

3 Computation of first and second derivatives of E_f **8**
3.0.1 First derivatives 8
3.0.2 Second derivatives 11

* *E-mail address*: betermin@uni-heidelberg.de

4 Application to Lennard-Jones type interactions **13**

5 The classical Lennard-Jones energy: numerical study, degeneracy as $A \to +\infty$ and conjecture **16**
5.1 Minimality among rhombic lattices 17
5.2 Minimality among rectangular lattices 19
5.3 Remarks about the global minimality 23
5.4 Summary of our results, numerical studies and conjectures 24

1 Introduction

1.1 Minimization at high and low densities: our previous works

In our previous work with Zhang [5], generalized in [3], we studied some two-dimensional lattice energies among Bravais lattices. More precisely, these energies are defined, for any Bravais lattice $L = \mathbb{Z}u \oplus \mathbb{Z}v$, by

$$E_f[L] := \sum_{p \in L \setminus \{0\}} f(|p|^2),$$

where $f : (0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is the interacting potential, with $|f(r)| = O(r^{-p})$, $p > 1$ in order to get $|E_f(L)| < +\infty$ for any $L \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Thus, using the optimality of the triangular lattice Λ_1 (see (2.1) for the precise definition of Λ_A) for the theta functions, defined for any $\alpha > 0$ by

$$\theta_L(\alpha) := \sum_{p \in L} e^{-\pi \alpha |p|^2},$$

proved by Montgomery [19], we get the minimality of the triangular lattice, at high density[1] (i.e. for an area $A \to 0$), for some interacting potentials f. In particular, we prove the following results for Lennard-Jones (see [3] for examples and motivation) type interactions defined, for $a = (a_1, a_2)$ and $t = (t_1, t_2)$, by

$$V_{a,t}^{LJ}(r) := \frac{a_2}{r^{t_2}} - \frac{a_1}{r^{t_1}}, \quad (a_1, a_2) \in (0, +\infty)^2, \quad 1 < t_1 < t_2. \tag{1.1}$$

Theorem 1.1 ([3, 5])**.** *Let $V_{a,t}^{LJ}$ defined by* (1.1)*, then:*

1. *for any $A \leq \pi \left(\frac{a_2 \Gamma(t_1)}{a_1 \Gamma(t_2)}\right)^{\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}}$, the triangular lattice Λ_A is the unique minimizer, up to rotation, of $L \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}[L]$ among Bravais lattices of fixed area A;*

2. *the triangular lattice Λ_A is a minimizer of $E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}$ among Bravais lattices of fixed area A if and only if*

$$A \leq \inf_{|L|=1, L \neq \Lambda_1} \left(\frac{a_2 \left(\zeta_L(2t_2) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(2t_2)\right)}{a_1 \left(\zeta_L(2t_1) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(2t_1)\right)} \right)^{\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}}, \tag{1.2}$$

   where the infimum is taken over the Bravais lattices L of area 1 and $\zeta_L(s) := \sum_{p \in L \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|p|^s}$, $s > 2$, is the Epstein zeta function;

3. *if $\pi^{-t_2} \Gamma(t_2) t_2 \leq \pi^{-t_1} \Gamma(t_1) t_1$, then the minimizer of $L \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}[L]$ among all the Bravais lattices (without a density constraint) is unique and triangular.*

[1] In this paper, as in [3, 5], we give our result in terms of area, i.e. the area $|u \wedge v|$ of the primitive cell of the lattices, instead of the density.

We remark that point 2. implies the non-minimality of Λ_A if A is sufficiently large. Hence, in [5], we numerically computed that the right side term of (1.2) in the classical case $V(r) = r^{-6} - 2r^{-3}$ is

$$A_{BZ} := \inf_{\substack{|L|=1 \\ L \neq \Lambda_1}} \left(\frac{\zeta_L(12) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(12)}{2(\zeta_L(6) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(6))} \right)^{1/3} \approx 1.138.$$

Furthermore, we conjectured that the square lattice must be a minimizer for some values of the area (in an interval) larger than A_{BZ}. Obviously, our method, based on the global optimality of the triangular lattice for $L \mapsto \theta_L(\alpha)$, was not adapted to prove the optimality of another lattice (square, rectangular or rhombic). Thus, the goal of this paper is to study $L \mapsto E_V[L]$ locally in order to get more information about the optimality of the triangular and the square lattice, and then to precise our conjecture about the minimizers with respect to the area.

The study of this kind of energy is important to find good competitors for some crystallization problems (see [6] for a recent review) where the interacting potential is radial (as in[27]). The study of $L \mapsto E_f[L]$ gives a good intuition of the shape of the minimizer of

$$\mathcal{E}_f(x_1, ..., x_N) := \sum_{i \neq j} f(|x_i - x_j|^2).$$

Furthermore, the triangular lattice plays a fundamental role. Indeed, it was proved by Rankin [22], Cassels [7], Ennola [13] and Diananda [12], in a series of improving papers (see the recent review by Henn [15]), that Λ_A is the only minimizer of $L \mapsto \zeta_L(s)$, $s > 0$, among Bravais lattices of fixed area A, for any $A > 0$. This result was rediscovered by Montgomery [19] from the optimality of the triangular lattice for the theta functions. Moreover, it is easy to show (see [3, Prop. 3.1]) that, for any $A > 0$, Λ_A is the unique minimizer of $L \mapsto E_f[L]$ if f is completely monotone. Hence, these results was profusely used in Mathematical Physics (Superconductivity, Bose-Einstein Condensates, di-block copolymer melts, etc.). Indeed, a lot of complex interactions are simplified as a two-body interaction in the periodic case (see for instance [1, 8, 21, 23, 25, 28]).

1.2 Main results about the local minimality of square and triangular lattices

Moreover, the local study of $L \mapsto E_f[L]$, i.e. to search for its local minimizers/maximizers and saddle points, allows to characterize the local stability of some special lattices. For that, it is efficient to use the usual parametrization in the 2d half modular domain[2] $\mathcal{D} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2; 0 \leq x \leq 1/2, y > 0; x^2 + y^2 \geq 1\}$, that we are going to present in Section 2.1, as in [19, 22]. Hence, the topology for the lattices is the usual topology in $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Furthermore, the square lattice corresponds to the point $(0, 1)$ and the triangular lattice to the point $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$. Montgomery used exactly this parametrization and proved that the theta functions admit only $(0, 1)$ and $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ as critical points: the first one is a saddle point and the second one is a (local) minimizer. We will write $E_f(x, y, A)$ with $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ instead of $E_f[L_A]$ for any Bravais lattice L_A of area A. More precisely, we will study energies defined, for $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $A > 0$, by

$$E_f(x, y, A) = \sum_{m,n} f\left(A \left[\frac{1}{y}(m + xn)^2 + yn^2 \right] \right),$$

where the sum is taken over all the $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \backslash \{(0, 0)\}$. The works of Coulangeon, Schürmann and Lazzarini [9, 10, 11] give the first general results for the local minimality of some lattices

[2] It is sufficient to study these energies wit parameters in $\mathcal{D}$ because of the symmetry of the energies with respect to the (Oy) axis.

(with enough symmetries) by using sphere designs. In particular, in two dimensions, due to their symmetries, the square and triangular lattices have good properties. They are critical points of $(x,y) \mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$ for any $A>0$ and any f such that the energy is differentiable (see [11, Thm. 4.4.(1)]). We are going to prove again this property in Section 3.0.1. In three dimensions, see [4, 14, 26] for the discussion of the local minimality of the body-centred-cubic and the face-centred-cubic lattices for Epstein zeta function and theta functions. For the second order study in dimension two, we will prove the following results, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the space of functions defined by (2.2):

Proposition 1.2 (See Cor. 3.8 and Prop. 3.10 below)**.** *For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the second derivatives at point $(0,1)$ are*

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^2_{xx} E_f(0,1,A) &= 2A \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) + 4A^2 \sum_{m,n} m^2 n^2 f''\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right),\\
\partial^2_{yy} E_f(0,1,A) &= 2A \sum_{m,n} m^2 f'\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) + A^2 \sum_{m,n} (n^2-m^2)^2 f''\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right),\\
\partial^2_{xy} E_f(0,1,A) &= \partial^2_{yx} E_f(0,1,A) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the second derivatives at point $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial^2_{xx} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right) = \partial^2_{yy} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right)\\
&= \frac{4A}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right) + \frac{4A^2}{3} \sum_{m,n} n^4 f''\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and $\partial^2_{xy} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right) = \partial^2_{yx} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right) = 0$.

In particular, the Hessians at the square and the triangular lattice are both diagonal. Hence, the usual sufficient condition associated to the nature of these critical points are given by two inequalities in the square case, and by only one condition in the triangular case. Thus, it is clear that, for any classical interacting potential $f \in \mathcal{F}$ (constructed with exponentials, inverse power laws or other classical functions), the triangular lattice is, for almost every $A>0$, a local minimizer or a local maximizer (see Corollary 3.12).

This very useful result could be applied to a lot of types of potentials. We choose here, as a prolongation of our previous works, to apply it to all the Lennard-Jones type potentials defined by (1.1). Hence, we find the largest open sets of values of the parameter A where the square and the triangular lattices are local minimizers/maximizers or saddle points on $\mathcal{D}$.

Theorem 1.3 (See Thm. 4.1 and Thm. 4.3 below)**.** *We define the following sums:*

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1(s) &= \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^4}{(m^2+mn+n^2)^s}, & S_2(s) &= \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2}{(m^2+n^2)^s},\\
S_3(s) &= \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2n^2}{(m^2+n^2)^s}, & S_4(s) &= \sum_{m,n} \frac{(n^2-m^2)^2}{(m^2+n^2)^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Part A: Local optimality of the triangular lattice. *For any (a,t) as in (1.1), let*

$$A_0 := \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\left(\frac{a_2 t_2 (t_2-1) S_1(t_2+2)}{a_1 t_1 (t_1-1) S_1(t_1+2)}\right)^{\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}},$$

then we have:

1. *if* $A < A_0$, *then* $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ *is a local minimizer of* $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}(x,y,A)$;

2. *if* $A > A_0$, *then* $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ *is a local maximizer of* $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}(x,y,A)$.

Part B. Local optimality of the square lattice. *Let*

$$g(s) = S_2(s+1) - 2(s+1)S_3(s+2), \quad k(s) = (s+1)S_4(s+2) - 2S_2(s+1),$$

and define

$$A_1 := \left(\frac{a_2 t_2 g(t_2)}{a_1 t_1 g(t_1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 := \left(\frac{a_2 t_2 k(t_2)}{a_1 t_1 k(t_1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}}.$$

It holds:

1. *if* $A_1 < A < A_2$, *then* $(0,1)$ *is a local minimizer of* $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}(x,y,A)$;

2. *if* $A \notin [A_1, A_2]$, *then* $(0,1)$ *is a saddle point of* $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}(x,y,A)$.

1.3 Conjecture for the classical Lennard-Jones potential

In particular, for the classical Lennard-Jones interaction V, i.e. $a = (2,1)$ and $t = (3,6)$, we will give a complete conjecture, improving that of [5], based on our previous result and numerical simulations among rhombic and rectangular lattices (see Section 2.2 for a precise definition of these lattices). A summary of this conjecture is given in Figure 1 and explained in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. Furthermore, we summarize in table 1 what is precisely conjectured, proved and numerically showed.



Figure 1: Conjecture about the minimization of $(x,y) \mapsto E_V(x,y,A)$ with respect to A. (1) If $0 < A < A_{BZ} \approx 1.138$, then the minimizer is triangular. (2) If $A_{BZ} < A < A_1 \approx 1.143$, then the minimizer is a rhombic lattice with an angle covering monotonically and continuously the interval $[76.43°, 90°)$. (3) If $A_1 < A < A_2 \approx 1.268$, then the minimizer is a square lattice. (4) If $A > A_2$, then the minimizer is a rectangular lattice which degenerate (the primitive cell is more and more thin) as $A \to +\infty$.

This conjecture is actually comparable to the numerical study of Ho and Mueller [20, Fig. 1 and 2] about the two-component Bose-Einstein Condensates (see also the review [17, Fig. 16]). Indeed,

Area A	Min of $L_A \mapsto E_V[L_A]$	Status
$0 < A < \frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} \approx 0.63693$	triangular	proved in [5]
$\frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} < A < A_{BZ} \approx 1.138$	triangular	num. + loc. min. proved in Th. 4.1
$A_{BZ} < A < A_1 \approx 1.143$	rhombic	num.
$A_1 < A < A_2 \approx 1.268$	square	num. + loc. min. proved in Th. 4.3
$A > A_2$	rectangular	num., proved for large A in Prop 5.5

Table 1: Summary of our works. The abbreviations "num." and "loc. min" correspond respectively to "numerically showed" and "local minimality".

$A^6 E_V(x, y, A)$ is the sum of two terms with opposite behavior. The first one, $\zeta_L(12)$, is minimized by the triangular lattice and the second one, $-A^3\zeta_L(6)$, admits a degenerate minimizer. We found exactly the same kind of terms in the energy studied by Ho and Mueller (see Section 5.4 for more explanations).

Using a method of Rankin [22] and bounding the minimizer of $y \mapsto E_V(0, y, A)$ in terms of A, we show the following result, which partially prove the point (4) of our Conjecture in Figure 1:

Theorem 1.4 (See Prop. 5.3 and Prop. 5.5 below)**.** *Let $V(r) = \frac{1}{r^6} - \frac{2}{r^3}$, then there exists $\tilde{A} > 0$ such that for any $A > \tilde{A}$, the minimizer (x_A, y_A) of $(x, y) \mapsto E_V(x, y, A)$ is such that $x_A = 0$, $y_A \geq 1$. Furthermore, we have $\lim_{A\to+\infty} y_A = +\infty$.*

After giving the precise definitions, in Section 2, of the parameters, energies and lattices we are going to study, we compute, for any $A > 0$, the first and second derivatives of $(x, y) \mapsto E_f(x, y, A)$ in Section 3. In particular, we prove Theorem 1.2. Thus, we apply this result to Lennard-Jones type potentials $V_{a,t}^{LJ}$ in Section 4 and we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 5, we study numerically $(x, y) \mapsto E_V(x, y, A)$ in the classical Lennard-Jones case $V(r) = r^{-6} - 2r^{-3}$, especially among rhombic and rectangular lattices, and we explain our Conjecture in Section 5.4.

2 Lattices, parametrization and energies

2.1 Lattice parametrization and general energy

Let $L = \mathbb{Z}u \oplus \mathbb{Z}v \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a Bravais lattice. We say that A is the area of L if $|u \wedge v| = A$, i.e. the area of its primitive cell is A. If L is of area $1/2$, we use the usual parametrization (see Rankin [22] or Montgomery [19]) of L by $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ where the half fundamental modular domain $\mathcal{D}$ is

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2; 0 \leq x \leq 1/2, y > 0; x^2 + y^2 \geq 1\}.$$

It corresponds to parametrize u and v with $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$u = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2y}}, 0\right) \quad \text{and} \quad v = \left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2y}}, \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\right).$$

Thus, a lattice L_A of area A is uniquely parametrized by vectors u_A and v_A such that

$$L_A = \mathbb{Z}u_A \oplus \mathbb{Z}v_A := \mathbb{Z}\left(\frac{\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{y}}, 0\right) \oplus \mathbb{Z}\left(\frac{x\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{y}}, \sqrt{A}\sqrt{y}\right),$$

with $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$. Therefore, we get, for any $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,

$$|mu_A + nv_A|^2 = A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m + xn)^2 + yn^2\right],$$

and all these values are the square of the distances between $(0,0)$ and the points of the lattice L_A.

We recall that the **triangular lattice** of area A (also called "hexagonal lattice" or "Abrikosov lattice" in the context of Superconductivity) is defined, up to rotation, by

$$\Lambda_A := \sqrt{\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}}\left[\mathbb{Z}(1,0) \oplus \mathbb{Z}(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)\right], \tag{2.1}$$

and the square lattice of area A is $\sqrt{A}\mathbb{Z}^2$.

In Figure 2, we have represented the fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}$. The point $(0,1)$ corresponds to the square lattice $2^{-1/2}\mathbb{Z}^2$ of area $1/2$ and $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ corresponds to the triangular lattice $\Lambda_{1/2}$ of area $1/2$.



Figure 2: Fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}$ and parametrization of a lattice L by (x,y).

We define the space of functions $\mathcal{F}$ by

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^*); \forall k \in \{0,1,2\}, |f^{(k)}(r)| = O(r^{-\eta_k - k}), \eta_k > 1 \right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Thus, for any $A > 0$, for any Bravais lattice L_A of area A and any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we define its f-energy by

$$E_f[L_A] = E_f(x,y,A) = \sum_{p \in L_A \setminus \{0\}} f(|p|^2) = \sum_{m,n} f\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right),$$

where the sum is taken over all $(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. Thus, the function $(x,y) \mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$ belongs to $C^2(\mathcal{D})$ and, for any $k \in \{1,2\}$,

$$\partial^{(k)} E_f(x,y,A) = \sum_{m,n} \partial^{(k)} f\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right), \tag{2.3}$$

with respect to any variables. Furthermore, the symmetry $E_f(-x,y,A) = E_f(x,y,A)$ justifies the fact that we study $(x,y) \mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$ in the half modular domain $\mathcal{D}$.

2.2 Rhombic and rectangular lattices

Definition 2.1. *We say that a Bravais lattice $L_A = \mathbb{Z}u_A \oplus \mathbb{Z}v_A$, parametrized by (x, y, A), is **rhombic** if it is generated by two vectors of same length $|u_A| = |v_A|$, which is equivalent with $x^2 + y^2 = 1$. In particular, if L_A is rhombic, then there exists $\theta \in \left[\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$ such that $x = \cos\theta$ and $y = \sin\theta$. Thus, we define, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, any $\pi/3 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$ and any $A > 0$,*

$$E_f(\theta, A) := E_f(\cos\theta, \sin\theta, A).$$

Lemma 2.1. *If $L_A = \mathbb{Z}u_A \oplus \mathbb{Z}v_A$ is rhombic and $(x, y) = (\cos\theta, \sin\theta)$, then $(\widehat{u_A, v_A}) = \theta$.*

Proof. This is clear because, since L is rhombic,

$$u_A \cdot v_A = \frac{Ax}{y} = |u_A||v_A|\cos(\widehat{u_A, v_A}) = A\frac{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}}{y}\cos(\widehat{u_A, v_A}) = \frac{A\cos(\widehat{u_A, v_A})}{y}.$$

Therefore $\cos(\widehat{u_A, v_A}) = x = \cos\theta$ and $(\widehat{u_A, v_A}) = \theta$ because $\theta \in [\pi/3, \pi/2]$. □

Definition 2.2. *We say that a Bravais lattice L_A, parametrized by (x, y, A), is **rectangular** if its primitive cell is a rectangle, i.e. $u_A \perp v_A$ or if $x = 0$ and $y \geq 1$. Thus, we define, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, any $y \geq 1$ and any $A > 0$,*

$$E_f(y, A) := E_f(0, y, A).$$

Remark 2.2. If L_A is rectangular, then it is generated by $u_A = \sqrt{A}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{y}}, 0\right)$ and $v_A = \sqrt{A}\,(0, \sqrt{y})$.

3 Computation of first and second derivatives of E_f

In this part, we compute the first and second derivatives of $(x, y) \mapsto E_f(x, y, A)$ with respect to x and y, for fixed $A > 0$. We do not give all the details of the computations, but only the key points.

3.0.1 First derivatives

The following results stay true if there is no conditions for the second derivative of f in the definition of $\mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, we are going to find again a result of Coulangeon and Schürmann [11, Thm. 4.4.(1)] in the simple two-dimensional case, that is to say the fact that the square lattice and the triangular lattice are both critical points of $L_A \mapsto E_f[L_A]$ for any $A > 0$. Indeed, all the shells of Λ_A and $\sqrt{A}\mathbb{Z}^2$ are 2-designs.

Proposition 3.1. *We have, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, any $A > 0$ and any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$,*

$$\partial_x E_f(x, y, A) = \frac{2A}{y}\sum_{m,n}(mn + n^2 x)f'\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m + xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right),$$

$$\partial_y E_f(x, y, A) = -\frac{A}{y^2}\sum_{m,n}(m^2 + 2xmn + (x^2 - y^2)n^2)f'\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m + xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right).$$

Proposition 3.2. *For any $A > 0$ and any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $(0, 1)$ is a critical point of $(x, y) \mapsto E_f(x, y, A)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, we get

$$\partial_x E_f(0, 1, A) = 2A\sum_{m,n} mnf'\left(A\left[m^2 + n^2\right]\right);$$

$$\partial_y E_f(0, 1, A) = -A\sum_{m,n}(m^2 - n^2)f'\left(A\left[m^2 + n^2\right]\right).$$

The first sum is equal to zero by pairing (m,n) and $(-m,n)$. The second is equal to zero because

$$\sum_{m,n} m^2 f(A[m^2+n^2]) = \sum_{m,n} n^2 f(A[m^2+n^2])$$

by exchange of variables. □

Lemma 3.3. *For any $(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$, let $q(m,n) = m^2+mn+n^2$ and $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that the following sums are convergent, then*

$$\sum_{m,n} mnF(q(m,n)) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{m,n} n^2 F(q(m,n)), \tag{3.1}$$

$$\sum_{m,n} n^3 mF(q(m,n)) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{m,n} n^4 F(q(m,n)), \tag{3.2}$$

$$\sum_{m,n} m^2n^2 F(q(m,n)) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m,n} n^4 F(q(m,n)). \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. The key point is the fact that, for any $(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\backslash\{(0,0)\}$,

$$q(-m-n,n) = q(m,n).$$

Consequently, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m,n} mnF(q(m,n)) &= \sum_{m,n}(-m-n)nF(q(m,n)) \\ &= -\sum_{m,n} mnF(q(m,n)) - \sum_{m,n} n^2F(q(m,n)),\end{aligned}$$

and (3.1) is proved. For the second equality, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m,n} mn^3F(q(m,n)) &= \sum_{m,n} n^3(-m-n)F(q(m,n)) \\ &= -\sum_{m,n} mn^3F(q(m,n)) - \sum_{m,n} n^4F(q(m,n))\end{aligned}$$

and (3.2) is clear. For the last one, we remark that, using $q(m,n) = q(n,m)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m,n} n^4F(q(m,n)) &= \sum_{m,n}(-m-n)^4F(q(m,n)) \\ &= \sum_{m,n}(2m^4+6m^2n^2+8m^3n)F(q(m,n)),\end{aligned}$$

and it follows that

$$\sum_{m,n} m^2n^2F(q(m,n)) = -\frac{1}{6}\sum_{m,n} n^4F(q(m,n)) - \frac{4}{3}\sum_{m,n} m^3nF(q(m,n)).$$

Combining this equality with (3.2), we get the result. □

Proposition 3.4. *For any $A > 0$ and any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ is a critical point of $(x,y) \mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$. In particular, we have*

$$\sum_{m,n}\left(mn+\frac{n^2}{2}\right) f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Using Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\partial_x E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right)=\frac{4A}{\sqrt{3}}\sum_{m,n}\left(mn+\frac{n^2}{2}\right)f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right)$$

and

$$\partial_y E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right)=-\frac{2A}{3}\sum_{m,n}\left(m^2+mn-\frac{n^2}{2}\right)f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right).$$

We remark, using the exchange of m and n, that

$$\partial_y E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right)=-\frac{2A}{3}\sum_{m,n}\left(mn+\frac{n^2}{2}\right)f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right)=-\frac{\partial_x E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right)}{2\sqrt{3}}.$$

Thus, by (3.1), we get

$$\sum_{m,n}mnf'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right)=-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{m,n}n^2f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right),$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{m,n}\left(mn+\frac{n^2}{2}\right)f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right)=0,$$

and the result is proved. □

Now we recall a simple application of Montgomery results [19] to the case of completely monotone interacting potentials. We say that f is completely monotone if, for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and any $r>0$, $(-1)^k f^{(k)}(r)\geq 0$.

Proposition 3.5. *([19]) If $f\in\mathcal{F}$ is completely monotone, then for any $A>0$ and for any (x,y) such that $0<x<1/2$ and $y>\sqrt{3}/2$, we have*

$$\partial_x E_f(x,y,A)<0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_y E_f(x,y,A)>0.$$

In particular, $(x,y)=(1/2,\sqrt{3}/2)$ is the only minimizer of $(x,y)\mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$ and $x=(0,1)$ is a saddle point. Furthermore, this function has no other critical point.

Proof. It is clear by Montgomery results [19, Lem. 4 and 7] and the fact (see [3, Section 3] for more details) that any completely monotone function f can be written as the Laplace transform of a positive Borel measure μ on $[0,+\infty)$, i.e.

$$f(r)=\int_0^{+\infty}e^{-rt}d\mu(t).$$

□

Examples 3.6. In particular, the previous Proposition holds for $f_{s/2}(r)=\frac{1}{r^{s/2}}$, $s>2$ and $f_\alpha(r)=e^{-\pi\alpha r}$. The first case corresponds to the Epstein zeta functions defined by

$$\zeta_{L_A}(s)=\sum_{p\in L_A\setminus\{0\}}\frac{1}{|p|^s},\tag{3.5}$$

which will be denoted by $\zeta(x,y,s,A)$ in the last part of this paper. The second case corresponds to the theta functions defined by

$$\theta_{L_A}(\alpha)=\sum_{p\in L_A}e^{-\pi\alpha|p|^2},\tag{3.6}$$

where the term $p=0$ is added.

3.0.2 Second derivatives

Proposition 3.7. *For any $A > 0$, any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^2_{xx} E_f(x,y,A) =& \frac{2A}{y} \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right) \\ &+ \frac{4A^2}{y^2} \sum_{m,n} (mn + n^2 x)^2 f''\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^2_{yy} E_f(x,y,A) =& \frac{2A}{y^3} \sum_{m,n} (m+xn)^2 f'\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right) \\ &+ A^2 \sum_{m,n} \left(n^2 - \frac{(m+xn)^2}{y^2}\right)^2 f''\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^2_{xy} E_f(x,y,A) =& -\frac{2A}{y^2} \sum_{m,n} (mn + n^2 x) f'\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right) \\ &+ \frac{2A^2}{y} \sum_{m,n} (mn + n^2 x)\left(n^2 - \frac{(m+xn)^2}{y^2}\right) f''\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right).\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ is a critical point of $(x, y) \mapsto E_f(x, y, A)$, then

$$\partial^2_{xy} E_f(x,y,A) = \frac{2A^2}{y} \sum_{m,n} (mn + n^2 x)\left(n^2 - \frac{(m+xn)^2}{y^2}\right) f''\left(A\left[\frac{1}{y}(m+xn)^2 + yn^2\right]\right). \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. Clear by direct computation. The last point follows from $\partial_x E_f(x, y, A) = 0$ and the expression of this derivative in Proposition 3.1. □

Corollary 3.8. *Let $A > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then the second derivatives at point $(0, 1)$ are:*

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^2_{xx} E_f(0,1,A) &= 2A \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) + 4A^2 \sum_{m,n} m^2 n^2 f''\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right), \\ \partial^2_{yy} E_f(0,1,A) &= 2A \sum_{m,n} m^2 f'\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) + A^2 \sum_{m,n} (n^2-m^2)^2 f''\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right), \\ \partial^2_{xy} E_f(0,1,A) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The both first results are obvious. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial^2_{xy} E_f(0,1,A) \\ &= -2A \sum_{m,n} mn f'\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) + 2A \sum_{m,n} mn(n^2-m^2) f''\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) = 0,\end{aligned}$$

by pairing, in each sums, (m, n) and $(-m, n)$. □

Proposition 3.9. *If $A > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$ are such that*

$$\begin{aligned}K^1_f(A) &:= \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) + 2A \sum_{m,n} m^2 n^2 f''\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) > 0, \\ K^2_f(A) &:= \sum_{m,n} 2m^2 f'\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) + A \sum_{m,n} (n^2-m^2)^2 f''\left(A\left[m^2+n^2\right]\right) > 0,\end{aligned}$$

then $(0, 1)$ is a local minimizer of $(x, y) \mapsto E_f(x, y, A)$.

Proof. It is clear by the previous corollary, and because $(0,1)$ is a critical point of the energy for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ (see Proposition 3.2). □

Proposition 3.10. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then the second derivatives at point $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ are:*

$$\begin{aligned} T_f(A) :&= \partial^2_{xx} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right) = \partial^2_{yy} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right) \\ &= \frac{4A}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right) + \frac{4A^2}{3} \sum_{m,n} n^4 f''\left(\frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2]\right), \end{aligned}$$

and $\partial^2_{xy} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right) = 0.$

Remark 3.11. Consequently, if $T_f(A) > 0$, then $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ is a local minimizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$ and if $T_f(A) < 0$, then $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ is a local maximizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$.

Proof. We write, for any $(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \backslash \{(0,0)\}$ and any $A > 0$,

$$Q_A(m,n) := \frac{2A}{\sqrt{3}}[m^2+mn+n^2].$$

A direct computation give us

$$\partial^2_{xx} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right) = \frac{4A}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) + \frac{16A^2}{3} \sum_{m,n} \left(mn + \frac{n^2}{2}\right)^2 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2_{yy} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right) =& \frac{16A}{3\sqrt{3}} \sum_{m,n} \left(m + \frac{n}{2}\right)^2 f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) \\ &+ A^2 \sum_{m,n} \left(n^2 - \frac{4}{3}\left(m + \frac{n}{2}\right)^2\right)^2 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2_{xy} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right) =& -\frac{8A}{3} \sum_{m,n} \left(mn + \frac{n^2}{2}\right) f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) \\ &+ \frac{4A^2}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{m,n} \left(mn + \frac{n^2}{2}\right)\left(n^2 - \frac{4}{3}\left(m + \frac{n}{2}\right)^2\right) f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us prove that $\partial^2_{xx} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right) = \partial^2_{yy} E_f\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, A\right)$, and more precisely

$$\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) = \frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}} \sum_{m,n} \left(m + \frac{n}{2}\right)^2 f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$\frac{16}{3} \sum_{m,n} \left(mn + \frac{n^2}{2}\right)^2 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) = \sum_{m,n} \left(n^2 - \frac{4}{3}\left(m + \frac{n}{2}\right)^2\right)^2 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right). \tag{3.9}$$

By (3.1), we get,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}}\sum_{m,n}\left(m+\frac{n}{2}\right)^2 f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) &= \frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}}\sum_{m,n}\left(m^2+\frac{n^2}{4}+mn\right) f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right)\\ &= \frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}}\sum_{m,n}\left(m^2+\frac{n^2}{4}-\frac{n^2}{2}\right) f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right)\\ &= \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}}\sum_{m,n} n^2 f'\left(Q_A(m,n)\right),\end{aligned}$$

and (3.8) is proved. For the second equality, applying (3.2) and (3.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m,n}\left(n^2-\frac{4}{3}\left(m+\frac{n}{2}\right)^2\right)^2 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) &= \frac{4}{9}\sum_{m,n}(5n^4+4m^3n) f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right)\\ &= \frac{4}{3}\sum_{m,n} n^4 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{16}{3}\sum_{m,n}\left(mn+\frac{n^2}{2}\right)^2 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right) &= \frac{16}{3}\sum_{m,n}\left(m^2n^2+\frac{n^4}{4}+mn^3\right) f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right)\\ &= \frac{16}{3}\sum_{m,n}\left(\frac{n^4}{2}+\frac{n^4}{4}-\frac{n^4}{2}\right) f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right)\\ &= \frac{4}{3}\sum_{m,n} n^4 f''\left(Q_A(m,n)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, (3.9) is established. By (3.1), the first sum in the expression of $\partial^2_{xy}E_f\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},A\right)$ is equal to 0. Combining (3.2) and (3.3), we easily prove that the second part is also equal to 0. □

Corollary 3.12. *If $f\in\mathcal{F}$ is analytic on an open neighbourhood of $(0,+\infty)$, then for almost every $A>0$, $(1/2,\sqrt{3}/2)$ is a local minimizer or a local maximizer of $(x,y)\mapsto E_f(x,y,A)$.*

Proof. If f is analytic, then f' and f'' are analytic on an open neighbourhood of $(0,+\infty)$ and T_f is also analytic on an open neighbourhood of $(0,+\infty)$. Then, the set of zeros of $A\mapsto T_f(A)$ is a discrete set and $T_f(A)\neq 0$ for almost every $A>0$. □

Examples 3.13. This result is true for any sum of inverse power laws $f(r)=\sum_{i=1}^p a_i r^{-s_i}$, $s_i>1$, any sum of exponential functions or any mixing of these type of functions (see [3] for more examples).

4 Application to Lennard-Jones type interactions

The aim of this part is to apply the previous results to Lennard-Jones type potentials. We recall our definition from [3, Section 6.3].

Definition 4.1. *For any $t=(t_1,t_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $1<t_1<t_2$ and any $a=(a_1,a_2)\in(0,+\infty)^2$, we define the Lennard-Jones type potential on $(0,+\infty)$ by*

$$V^{LJ}_{a,t}(r) := \frac{a_2}{r^{t_2}}-\frac{a_1}{r^{t_1}}.$$

Hence, its lattice energy is defined, for any Bravais lattice $L \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, by

$$E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}[L] = a_2\zeta_L(2t_2) - a_1\zeta_L(2t_1),$$

where the Epstein zeta function of lattice L is defined, for $s > 2$, by $\zeta_L(s) = \sum_{p \in L\setminus\{0\}} \frac{1}{|p|^s}$.



Figure 3: Graph of $r \mapsto V_{a,t}^{LJ}(r^2)$

Furthermore, we define the following lattice sums:

$$S_1(s) = \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^4}{(m^2+mn+n^2)^s}, \qquad S_2(s) = \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2}{(m^2+n^2)^s},$$
$$S_3(s) = \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2n^2}{(m^2+n^2)^s}, \qquad S_4(s) = \sum_{m,n} \frac{(n^2-m^2)^2}{(m^2+n^2)^s}.$$

As we explained in [3, Section 6.3], these potentials are used in molecular simulation (classical interaction between atoms, hydrogen bonds, for finding energetically favourable regions in protein binding sites) or in the study of social aggregation [18]. In particular, the classical $(12-6)$ Lennard-Jones potential (see [16]) is a good simple model that approximates the interaction between neutral atoms.

Theorem 4.1. *For any (a,t) as in Definition 4.1, let*

$$A_0 := \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\left(\frac{a_2t_2(t_2-1)S_1(t_2+2)}{a_1t_1(t_1-1)S_1(t_1+2)}\right)^{\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}},$$

then we have:

1. *if $A < A_0$, then $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ is a local minimizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}(x,y,A)$;*
2. *if $A > A_0$, then $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right)$ is a local maximizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V_{a,t}^{LJ}}(x,y,A)$.*

Proof. According to Proposition 3.10, we easily get

$$T_f(A) = \frac{4A}{\sqrt{3}}\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2A}\right)^{t_2+1}\left\{-a_1t_1\left(\sqrt{3}/2\right)^{t_1-t_2}h(t_1)A^{t_2-t_1} + a_2t_2h(t_2)\right\},$$

where $h(s) = \dfrac{s+1}{2}S_1(s+2) - \displaystyle\sum_{m,n}\frac{m^2}{(m^2+mn+n^2)^{s+1}}$. Now, by (3.2) and (3.3), we remark that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m,n}\frac{m^2}{(m^2+mn+n^2)^{s+1}} &= \sum_{m,n}\frac{m^2(m^2+mn+n^2)}{(m^2+mn+n^2)^{s+2}}\\ &= \sum_{m,n}\frac{m^2n^2+mn^3+m^4}{(m^2+mn+n^2)^{s+2}}\\ &= S_1(s+2).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$h(s) = \frac{s-1}{2}S_1(s+2),$$

and $T_f(A) > 0$ if and only if $A < A_0$. The second point is clear. □

Remark 4.2. In the particular case $a = (2,1)$ and $t = (3,6)$, the interaction potential is

$$V(r) = \frac{1}{r^6} - \frac{2}{r^3},$$

and $V(r^2) = \dfrac{1}{r^{12}} - \dfrac{2}{r^6}$ is the so-called classical Lennard-Jones potential. The previous result shows that, for any $A < A_0 \approx 1.152438$, then the triangular lattice is a local minimizer of $L \mapsto E_V[L_A]$, and if $A > A_0$, then the triangular lattice is a local maximizer.

Theorem 4.3. *For any (a,t) as in Definition 4.1, let*

$$g(s) = S_2(s+1) - 2(s+1)S_3(s+2), \quad k(s) = (s+1)S_4(s+2) - 2S_2(s+1),$$

and define

$$A_1 := \left(\frac{a_2t_2g(t_2)}{a_1t_1g(t_1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 := \left(\frac{a_2t_2k(t_2)}{a_1t_1k(t_1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}}.$$

It holds:

1. *if $A_1 < A < A_2$, then $(0,1)$ is a local minimizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V^{LJ}_{a,t}}(x,y,A)$;*
2. *if $A \notin [A_1, A_2]$, then $(0,1)$ is a saddle point of $(x,y) \mapsto E_{V^{LJ}_{a,t}}(x,y,A)$.*

Proof. We use Proposition 3.9 and we compute

$$\begin{aligned}K^1_{V^{LJ}_{a,t}}(A) &= \frac{1}{A^{t_2+1}}\left\{a_1t_1g(t_1)A^{t_2-t_1} - a_2t_2g(t_2)\right\},\\ K^2_{V^{LJ}_{a,t}}(A) &= \frac{1}{A^{t_2+1}}\left\{-a_1t_1k(t_1)A^{t_2-t_1} + a_2t_2k(t_2)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, we remark that $g(s) > 0$ and $k(s) > 0$. Indeed, we have

$$g(s) = \sum_{m,n}\frac{m^2}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+1}} - 2(s+1)\sum_{m,n}\frac{m^2n^2}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}}$$

$$= \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2(m^2+n^2)}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}} - 2(s+1)\sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2n^2}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}}$$
$$= \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^4}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}} - (2s+1)\sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2n^2}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}}.$$

By change of variable $(m,n) = (k+\ell, k-\ell)$, we obtain, since the number of terms is larger in the sum on the right than in the left one,

$$\sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2n^2}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}} \leq \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{(k+\ell)^2(k-\ell)^2}{(2k^2+2\ell^2)^{s+2}}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2^{s+2}} \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{k^4+\ell^4-2k^2\ell^2}{(k^2+\ell^2)^{s+2}},$$
$$= \frac{1}{2^{s+1}} \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{k^4}{(k^2+\ell^2)^{s+2}} - \frac{1}{2^{s+1}} \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{k^2\ell^2}{(k^2+\ell^2)^{s+2}},$$

i.e. $\displaystyle\sum_{m,n} \frac{m^2n^2}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}} \leq \frac{1}{1+2^{s+1}} \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^4}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}}$. Therefore, we get, for any $s > 1$,

$$g(s) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1+2s}{1+2^{s+1}}\right) > 0.$$

With exactly the same arguments, we find, for any $s > 1$,

$$k(s) \geq \left(\frac{s2^{s+2}-4}{1+2^{s+1}}\right) \sum_{m,n} \frac{m^4}{(m^2+n^2)^{s+2}} > 0.$$

Hence, the result is proved because

$$K^1_{V^{LJ}_{a,t}}(A) > 0 \iff A > A_1 \quad \text{and} \quad K^2_{V^{LJ}_{a,t}}(A) > 0 \iff A < A_2.$$

□

Remark 4.4. In the classical Lennard-Jones case $a = (2,1)$ and $t = (3,6)$, we numerically compute $A_1 \approx 1.1430032$ and $A_2 \approx 1.2679987$. In particular, if $A > A_2$, then the square lattice cannot be a minimizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_V(x,y,A)$.

5 The classical Lennard-Jones energy: numerical study, degeneracy as $A \to +\infty$ and conjecture

In this part, we study the energy per point associated to the classical Lennard-Jones potential, i.e. $a = (2,1)$ and $t = (3,6)$. Hence, the corresponding interaction potential is given by

$$V(r) = \frac{1}{r^6} - \frac{2}{r^3},$$

and its lattice energy is defined, for any Bravais lattice L, by

$$E_V[L] = \zeta_L(12) - 2\zeta_L(6).$$

Domain	Area A	Minimizer θ_A	Status
Rh1	$0 < A < \frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} \approx 0.63693$	$60°$	proved in [5]
Rh2	$\frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} < A < A_{BZ} \approx 1.1378475$	$60°$	num.+loc. min. proved in Th. 4.1
Rh3	$A_{BZ} < A < A_1 \approx 1.143003$	$76.43° \leq \theta < 90°$	num.
Rh4	$A > A_1$	$90°$	num.+loc. min. proved in Th. 4.3

Table 2: Summary of our numerical and theoretical studies for the minimization among rhombic lattices of $L_A \mapsto E_V[L_A]$.

5.1 Minimality among rhombic lattices

In Table 2, we give the results of our numerical and theoretical investigations for the minimization of

$$\theta \mapsto E_V(\theta, A) := E_V(\cos\theta, \sin\theta, A)$$

with respect to the area A. For any fixed $A > 0$, we call θ_A a minimizer of $\theta \mapsto E_V(\theta, A)$. We split $(0, +\infty)$ into four domains Rhi, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, and we explain below these results.

In [5, Theorem 3.1], we proved that if $0 < A < \frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}}$, then Λ_A is the unique minimizer of $L \mapsto E_V[L]$ among Bravais lattices of fixed area A. Hence, it is clear that, on Rh1, $\theta_A = 60°$.

The optimality of $\theta_A = 60°$ on Rh2 follows from [5, Proposition 3.5]. Indeed, we proved that Λ_A is a minimizer of $L \mapsto E_V[L]$ among Bravais lattices of fixed area A if and only if

$$A \leq A_{BZ} := \inf_{\substack{|L|=1 \\ L \neq \Lambda_1}} \left(\frac{\zeta_L(12) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(12)}{2(\zeta_L(6) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(6))} \right)^{1/3},$$

and we numerically compute

$$A_{BZ} \approx 1.1378475.$$

Furthermore, see Figure 4 for the $A = 1$ case.



Figure 4: Plot of $\theta \mapsto E_V(\theta, 1)$, for $A = 1$, on $[\pi/3, \pi/2]$. The minimizer seems to be $\theta_A = 60°$.

For an area between $A_{BZ} \approx 1.13785$ and $A_1 \approx 1.43003$, the minimizer seems (numerically) to cover monotonically and continuously the interval $[76.43°, 90°)$ (see Figure 5, 6 and 7). There is no doubt about the fact that the transition from $60°$ to $76.43°$ is discontinuous (see Figure 5).

For A in the domain Rh4, our numerical simulations give us the optimality of $\theta_A = 90°$ for $A_1 < A < 20$. We will see in the next subsection that the minimizer seems to stay rectangular if A is large enough (see Figure 8 for the $A = 3$ case).



Figure 5: Plots of $\theta \mapsto E_V(\theta, A)$ on $[\pi/3, \pi/2]$, for $A = 1.137$ (on the left) and $A = 1.138$ (on the right). The minimizer seems to be $\theta_A = 60°$ for $A = 1.137$ and $\theta_A = 76.43°$ for $A = 1.138$.



Figure 6: Plot of $\theta \mapsto E_V(\theta, 1.141)$ on $[\pi/3, \pi/2]$, for $A = 1.141$. The minimizer seems to be $\theta_A \approx 82.51°$.



Figure 7: Plots of $\theta \mapsto E_V(\theta, A)$ on $[\pi/3, \pi/2]$, for $A = 1.142$ (on the left) and $A = 1.1431$ (on the right). The minimizer seems to be $\theta_A \approx 89.74°$ for $A = 1.142$ and $\theta_A = 90°$ for $A = 1.1431$.



Figure 8: Plot of $\theta \mapsto E_V(\theta, 3)$ on $[\pi/3, \pi/2]$, for $A = 3$. The minimizer seems to be $\theta_A = 90°$.

Domain	**Area A**	**Minimizer y_A**	**Status**
Rect1	$0 < A < \frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} \approx 0.63693$	1	proved in [5]
Rect2	$\frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} < A < A_2 \approx 1.2679987$	1	num.+loc. min. proved in Th. 4.3
Rect3	$A > A_2$	$\nearrow$ on $(1, +\infty)$	num.+proved for large A in Prop. 5.3

Table 3: Summary of our numerical and theoretical studies for the minimization among rhombic lattices of $L_A \mapsto E_V[L_A]$.

Remark 5.1. It numerically appears that the minimizers of $(x, y) \mapsto E_V(x, y, A)$ on $\mathcal{D}$ are rhombic lattices if $0 < A < A_2$.

5.2 Minimality among rectangular lattices

As in the previous subsection, we give the results of our numerical and theoretical investigations for the minimization of

$$y \mapsto E_V(y, A) := E_V(0, y, A)$$

with respect to area A in Table 3. For any fixed $A > 0$, we call y_A a minimizer of $y \mapsto E_V(y, A)$. We split $(0, +\infty)$ into three domains Recti, $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and we explain below these results. In particular, we will partially explain the behavior of the minimizer on Rect3.

The optimality of $y_A = 1$, i.e. the square lattice, on Rect1 is clear by [5, Theorem 3.1] and Montgomery result [19, Lemma 7]. Indeed, Montgomery proved that $\partial_y \theta(x, y, \alpha) \geq 0$ for any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ and any $\alpha > 0$, where $\theta(x, y, \alpha) := E_{f_\alpha}(x, y, 1/2)$ and $f_\alpha(r) = e^{-\pi\alpha r}$. Furthermore, we proved in [5, Theorem 3.1] that, for any $0 < A < \frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}}$ and any Bravais lattice L_A with area A,

$$E_V[L_A] = C_A + \frac{\pi^3}{A^3} \int_1^{+\infty} \left(\theta_{L_A}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2A}\right) - 1 \right) g_A(\alpha) \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha},$$

where C_A is a constant depending on A but independent of L_A and $g_A(\alpha) \geq 0$ for any $\alpha \geq 1$. Thus, we get

$$\partial_y E_V(y, A) \geq 0$$

for any $y \geq 1$ when $0 < A < \frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}}$. Therefore, $y = 1$ is the unique minimizer of $y \mapsto E_V(y, A)$.

On Rect2, $y = 1$ seems numerically to be the minimizer (see Figure 9). Actually, it is not difficult to prove rigorously, by using the algorithmic method detailed in [4, Lem. 4.19], that $y \mapsto E_V(y, A)$ is an increasing function, for some $A \in$ Rect2.



Figure 9: Plots of $y \mapsto E_V(y, A)$ for $A = 0.8$ (on the left) and $A = 1$ (on the right). It seems that the minimizer is $y_A = 1$.



Figure 10: Plots of $y \mapsto E_V(y, A)$ for $A = 1.26$ (on the left) and $A = 1.27$ (on the right). It seems that the minimizer is $y_A = 1$ in the fist case and $y_A \approx 1.033$ in the second case.

Numerically, in the domain Rect3, the minimizer seems to cover $(1, +\infty)$ monotonically and continuously with respect to A. In particular, we have the degeneracy of the minimizer as A goes to infinity, i.e. $\lim_{A\to+\infty} y_A = +\infty$ (see Figures 10, 11 and 12).

Remark 5.2. The degeneracy of the minimizer, as $A \to +\infty$, follows from the fact that

$$E_V[L_A] = \frac{1}{A^6}\left\{\zeta_L(12) - 2A^3\zeta_L(6)\right\} \sim -\frac{2}{A^3}\zeta_L(6)$$

and the derivative, with respect to x, of the right side expression is positive by Proposition 3.5. Furthermore, the competition between $\zeta_L(12)$ and $-2A^3\zeta_L(6)$ is naturally won by the first one as $A \to 0$, and that explains why the triangular lattice is the minimizer for $A \in$ Rect1.

The following results prove the degeneracy of the minimizer among rectangular lattices, as $A \to +\infty$, and the fact that the minimizer of $L_A \mapsto E_V[L_A]$ is rectangular if A is large enough.

Proposition 5.3. ***(Degeneracy in the rectangular case)*** *There exists $A_3 > 0$ such that, if $y_A \geq 1$ is a minimizer of $y \mapsto E_V(y; A)$, then for any $A > A_3$,*

$$X_1(A)^{1/3} \leq y_A \leq X_2(A)^{1/3} \tag{5.1}$$



Figure 11: Plots of $y \mapsto E_V(y, A)$ for $A = 2$ (on the left) and $A = 4$ (on the right).



Figure 12: Plots of $y \mapsto E_V(y, A)$ for $A = 8$ (on the left) and $A = 20$ (on the right).

where

$$X_1(A) = \frac{2\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6)A^3 - \sqrt{4\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6)^2A^6 - 32A^4 + 8\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(12)A^2}}{4}$$

and

$$X_2(A) = \frac{2\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6)A^3 + \sqrt{4\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6)^2A^6 - 32A^4 + 8\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(12)A^2}}{4}$$

In particular,

1. *we have* $\lim_{A\to+\infty} y_A = +\infty$*;*
2. *more precisely, there exists* $C > 0$ *such that, for any* $A > A_3$*,* $y_A \leq CA$*.*

Proof. Let $A > 0$ and $y \geq 1$, then we have

$$E_V(y, A) = A^{-6}\left(y^6 \sum_{m,n} \frac{1}{(m^2 + y^2n^2)^6} - 2y^3A^3 \sum_{m,n} \frac{1}{(m^2 + y^2n^2)^3}\right).$$

Let y_A be a minimizer, then we have $E_V(y_A, A) \leq E_V(A^{1/3}, A)$, that is to say

$$y_A^6 \sum_{m,n} \frac{1}{(m^2 + y_A^2n^2)^6} - 2y_A^3A^3 \sum_{m,n} \frac{1}{(m^2 + y_A^2n^2)^3} \leq A^2 \sum_{m,n} \frac{1}{(m^2 + A^{2/3}n^2)^6} - 2A^4 \sum_{m,n} \frac{1}{(m^2 + A^{2/3}n^2)^3}.$$

We remark that, for any $s \in \{3, 6\}$ and $\alpha \geq 1$,

$$2 \leq \sum_{m,n} \frac{1}{(m^2 + \alpha n^2)^s} \leq \zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(2s).$$

Thus, we get, for $A \geq 1$,

$$-4A^4 + 2y_A^3 \zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6) A^3 + \zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(12) A^2 - 2y_A^6 \geq 0.$$

In particular, this inequality fails if A is enough large. Indeed, we can rewrite this inequality as $R_A(y_A^3) \geq 0$ with

$$R_A(X) := -2X^2 + 2\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6) A^3 X + \zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(12) A^2 - 4A^4.$$

The discriminant of polynomial R_A is

$$\Delta_A = 4\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6)^2 A^6 + 8(\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(12) A^2 - 4A^4).$$

Thus, if A is sufficiently large, then $0 < \Delta_A < 4\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}^2}(6)^2 A^6$. If follows that R_A admits two positive zeros if A is enough large, which are $1 \leq X_1(A) < X_2(A)$ given in the statement of the proposition. Therefore, $R_A(y_A^3) \geq 0$ implies that, for A large enough, $X_1(A) \leq y_A^3 \leq X_2(A)$ with

$$X_1(A)^{1/3} \sim C_1 A^{1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad X_2(A)^{1/3} \sim C_2 A,$$

as $A \to +\infty$, where C_1 and C_2 are both positive constants, and the result is proved. □

Remark 5.4. It is crystal clear that the same result holds for all the Lennard-Jones type potentials.

The following result shows why the minimizer is rectangular if A is large enough.

Proposition 5.5. ***(The minimizer is rectangular for sufficiently small density)*** *There exists $A_4 > 0$ such that for any $A > A_4$, a minimizer (x_A, y_A) of $(x, y) \mapsto E_V(x, y, A)$ satisfies $x_A = 0$, i.e. a minimizer is a rectangular lattice.*

Proof. Let us prove that, for A sufficiently large and any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$, $\partial_x E_V(x, y, A) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $x = 0$. Using Rankin's notations [22, Section 4., p. 157] and the notation of Examples 3.6 for the Epstein zeta function, we get, for any $x \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&A^6 \partial_x E_V(x, y, A) \\
&= \partial_x \zeta(x, y, 12, 1) - 2A^3 \partial_x \zeta(x, y, 6, 1) \\
&= \frac{16\sqrt{\pi}}{4 \sin^2 \pi x} \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \left(\frac{C_1}{y^3} \Lambda(k, y, 3) A^3 - \frac{C_2}{y^6} \Lambda(k, y, 6) \right) \{(k+1) \sin 2\pi x - \sin 2\pi(k+1)x\} \\
&= \frac{16\sqrt{\pi}}{4y^6 \sin^2 \pi x} \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \left(C_1 y^3 \Lambda(k, y, 3) A^3 - C_2 \Lambda(k, y, 6) \right) \{(k+1) \sin 2\pi x - \sin 2\pi(k+1)x\}
\end{aligned}$$

where

- C_1 and C_2 are both positive constants;
- $\Lambda(k, y, s) := \lambda_{k+2}(y, s) - 2\lambda_{k+1}(y, s) + \lambda_k(y, s)$;
- $\lambda_k(y, s) := \sigma_{1-2s}(k)(2\pi k y)^{s+1/2} K_{s-1/2}(2\pi k y)$;

- $\sigma_k(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^k$;
- $K_\nu(u) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-u\cosh t}\cosh(\nu t)dt$.

Rankin [22, Eq. (21)] proved that $\Lambda(k,y,3) > 0$ for any $k \geq 1$ and any $y \geq \sqrt{3}/2$. Furthermore, by definition, we can write $\Lambda(k,y,3) = y^{7/2}\tilde{\Lambda}(k,y,3)$ and $\Lambda(k,y,6) = y^{13/2}\tilde{\Lambda}(k,y,6)$, where $\tilde{\Lambda}(k,y,3)$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}(k,y,6)$ have the same order with respect to y. Therefore, we get, for any $(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &A^6\partial_x E_V(x,y,A) \\ &= \frac{16\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{y}}{4\sin^2\pi x}\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty}\left(C_1\tilde{\Lambda}(k,y,3)A^3 - C_2\tilde{\Lambda}(k,y,6)\right)\left\{(k+1)\sin 2\pi x - \sin 2\pi(k+1)x\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since (see Rankin [22, p. 158])

$$1 \leq \sigma_{1-2s}(r) < \zeta(2s-1), \quad s \in \{3,6\}$$

and (see [19, p. 81])

$$(k+1)\sin 2\pi x - \sin 2\pi(k+1)x \geq 0, \quad k \geq 1, 0 \leq x \leq 1/2,$$

with equality for any $k \geq 1$ if and only if $x = 0$, we obtain that this quantity is positive, for any $(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}$, for A large enough. Consequently, there exists A_4 such that for any $A > A_4$,

$$\partial_x E_V(x,y,A) \geq 0,$$

with equality if and only if $x = 0$. Thus, we get $x_A = 0$ for any $A > A_4$. □

A summary of both previous results is:

Corollary 5.6. *For any $A > 0$, we call $(x_A, y_A) \in \mathcal{D}$ a minimizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_V(x,y,A)$. Then:*

1. *for A large enough, $x_A = 0$;*
2. *it holds $\lim_{A\to+\infty} y_A = +\infty$.*

Remark 5.7. It numerically appears that the minimizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_V(x,y,A)$ on $\mathcal{D}$ is a rectangular lattice for any $A > A_1$.

5.3 Remarks about the global minimality

Using our previous work [5], we can prove the following result explaining why the $A = 1$ case is fundamental for finding the global minimizer of the Lennard-Jones energy, among Bravais lattices, without area constraint.

Proposition 5.8. *If $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ is the unique minimizer of $(x,y) \mapsto E_V(x,y,1)$, then the global minimizer of $(x,y,A) \mapsto E_V(x,y,A)$ is unique and triangular.*

Proof. By [5, Proposition 3.5], we know that Λ_A is a minimizer of $L \mapsto E_V[L]$ among Bravais lattices of fixed area A if and only if

$$A \leq \inf_{\substack{|L|=1 \\ L\neq\Lambda_1}} \left(\frac{\zeta_L(12) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(12)}{2(\zeta_L(6) - \zeta_{\Lambda_1}(6))}\right)^{1/3}.$$

Furthermore, we proved in [5, Proposition 4.1] that the area of a global minimizer is smaller than 1. Thus, if the triangular lattice is the unique minimizer among Bravais lattices of fixed area 1, then it is the case for every fixed area such that $0 < A < 1$. Consequently, the minimizer of the energy is unique and triangular, because the minimum among dilated triangular lattices with respect to the area is unique. □

We numerically check that $(1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ seems to be the minimizer of $(x, y) \mapsto E_V(x, y, 1)$, but a rigorous proof have to be done. A strategy could be the following:

1. By Rankin's method (see proof of Proposition 5.5), we find $\partial_x E_V(x, y, 1) \leq 0$ for any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$, with equality if and only if $x = 1/2$;
2. By the same arguments as in Proposition 5.3, it is possible to prove that the minimizer of $y \mapsto E_V(1/2, y, 1)$ admits an upper bound y_1;
3. By the algorithmic method based on [4, Lem. 4.19], the minimizer is $y = \sqrt{3}/2$ on $[1, y_1]$.

While the first point seems difficult to prove by using classical estimates, the proofs of both other points are clear.

5.4 Summary of our results, numerical studies and conjectures

In this part, we summarize the supposed behavior of the minimizer (x_A, y_A) of $(x, y) \mapsto E_V(x, y, A)$ based on our theoretical and numerical studies among rhombic and rectangular lattices. The summary is given in Figure 18. In the following description, we detail the proved results and the conjectures based on numerical investigations.

More precisely, we have:

1. For $0 < A < \frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} \approx 0.637$, the minimizer is **triangular**. This is proved in [5, Theorem 3.1];
2. For $\frac{\pi}{(120)^{1/3}} < A < A_{BZ} \approx 1.138$, the minimizer seems to be **triangular**. This is only a numerical result. In particular, if we know that $A_{BZ} > 1$, then the global minimizer of $L \mapsto E_V[L]$, without a density constraint, is unique and triangular (see Proposition 5.8);



Figure 13: Triangular lattice

3. For $A_{BZ} < A < A_0 \approx 1.152$, the **triangular lattice is a local minimizer** by Theorem 4.1;
4. For $A_{BZ} < A < A_1 \approx 1.143$, the minimizer seems, numerically, to be a **rhombic lattice**. More precisely it covers continuously and monotonically the interval of angles $[76.43°, 90°)$;
5. For $A_1 < A < A_2 \approx 1.268$, **the square lattice is a local minimizer**, by Theorem 4.3. Furthermore, it seems, numerically, that the square lattice is the unique minimizer;
6. For $A > A_2$, then it seems, numerically, that the minimizer is a **rectangular lattice**. For A large enough, we give a **proof** of this fact in Proposition 5.5;



Figure 14: Rhombic lattice



Figure 15: Square lattice



Figure 16: Rectangular lattice

7. As $A \to +\infty$, the minimizer becomes **more and more thin and rectangular**: it degenerates.



Figure 17: Degeneracy of the rectangular lattice

This minimizer's shape evolution and the numerical investigations of Ho and Mueller [20, Fig. 1 and 2] (or see [17]), about two-component Bose-Einstein Condensates, are very similar. It is not difficult to understand why. Indeed, in their work, Ho and Muller consider the following lattice energy

$$E_\delta(L,u) := \theta_L(1) + \delta\theta_{L+u}(1),$$

among Bravais lattices $L \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of area one and vectors $u \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where $\theta_L(\alpha)$ is defined by (3.6),

$$\theta_{L+u}(1) = \sum_{p\in L} e^{-\pi|p+u|^2}$$



Figure 18: Behavior of the minimizer of $(x, y) \mapsto E_V(x, y, A)$ with respect to A.

and $-1 \leq \delta \leq 1$. Thus, as we explained in [4], this energy is the sum of two energies with opposite properties:

1. $L \mapsto \theta_L(1)$ is minimized by the triangular lattice Λ_1;
2. For any $u \notin L$, $\theta_{L+u}(1) < \theta_L(1)$ and $L \mapsto \theta_{L+u}(1)$ does not admit any minimizer. More precisely, there exists a sequence of rectangular lattices $(L_k)_k$ which degenerate, as explained in Section 5.2, such that $\lim_{k\to+\infty} \theta_{L_k+c_k}(1) = 0$, where c_k is the center of the primitive cell of L_k.

Hence, since, for $L_A = \sqrt{A}L$ where L has a unit area,

$$A^6 E_V[L_A] = \zeta_L(12) - A^3\zeta_L(6),$$

$\theta_L(1)$ and $\theta_{L+u}(1)$ can be compared respectively to $\zeta_L(12)$ and $-\zeta_L(6)$. Furthermore, δ can be compared to A^3. Increasing δ (respectively A), Ho and Mueller find, as in this paper, that $L \mapsto \operatorname{argmin}_L\{\min_{(L,u)}\{E_\delta(L, u)\}\}$ (respectively $\operatorname{argmin}_L\{E_V[L]\}$ for us) is triangular at the beginning, becoming rhombic (with a discontinuous transition), square and finally rectangular. Another recent work [2, 24] on Wigner bilayers presents a surprising similarity.

It is actually natural to conjecture that:

- the behavior of the minimizers of $L \mapsto E_f[L_A]$ with respect to the area A is qualitatively the same for all the Lennard-Jones type potentials;
- more generally, we can imagine that we find the same result for any potential f written as

  $$f = f_1 - f_2,$$

  where f_1 and f_2 are both completely monotone and f has a well, i.e. f is decreasing on $(0, a)$ and increasing on $(a, +\infty)$, because, for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $L \mapsto E_{f_i}[L_A]$ has the same properties as $L \mapsto \theta_L(\alpha)$, for any $\alpha > 0$ (see Proposition 3.5).

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank the Mathematics Center Heidelberg (MATCH) for support, Doug Hardin for giving me the intuition of the degeneracy of the minimizer for the Lennard-Jones interaction, Mircea Petrache for giving me a first feedback and Florian Nolte for interesting discussions.

References

[1] A. Aftalion, X. Blanc, and F. Nier. Lowest Landau level functional and Bargmann spaces for Bose–Einstein condensates. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 241:661–702, 2006.

[2] M. Antlanger, G. Kahl, M. Mazars, L. Samaj, and E. Trizac. Rich polymorphic behavior of Wigner bilayers. *Physical Review Letters*, 2016.

[3] L. Bétermin. Two-dimensional Theta Functions and Crystallization among Bravais Lattices. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 48(5):3236–3269, 2016.

[4] L. Bétermin and M. Petrache. Dimension reduction techniques for the minimization of theta functions on lattices. *Preprint. arXiv:1607.08716*, 07 2016.

[5] L. Bétermin and P. Zhang. Minimization of energy per particle among Bravais lattices in $\mathbb{R}^2$: Lennard-Jones and Thomas-Fermi cases. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 17(6):1450049, 2015.

[6] X. Blanc and M. Lewin. The Crystallization Conjecture: A Review. *EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences*, 2:255–306, 2015.

[7] J.W.S. Cassels. On a Problem of Rankin about the Epstein Zeta-Function. *Proceedings of the Glasgow Mathematical Association*, 4:73–80, 7 1959.

[8] X. Chen and Y. Oshita. An application of the modular function in nonlocal variational problems. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 186(1):109–132, 2007.

[9] R. Coulangeon. Spherical Designs and Zeta Functions of Lattices. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, ID 49620(16), 2006.

[10] R. Coulangeon and G. Lazzarini. Spherical Designs and Heights of Euclidean Lattices. *Journal of Number Theory*, 141:288–315, 2014.

[11] R. Coulangeon and A. Schürmann. Energy Minimization, Periodic Sets and Spherical Designs. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, pages 829–848, 2012.

[12] P. H. Diananda. Notes on Two Lemmas concerning the Epstein Zeta-Function. *Proceedings of the Glasgow Mathematical Association*, 6:202–204, 7 1964.

[13] V. Ennola. A Lemma about the Epstein Zeta-Function. *Proceedings of The Glasgow Mathematical Association*, 6:198–201, 1964.

[14] V. Ennola. On a Problem about the Epstein Zeta-Function. *Mathematical Proceedings of The Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 60:855–875, 1964.

[15] A. Henn. The Hexagonal Lattice and the Epstein Zeta Function. *Dynamical Systems, Number Theory and Applications A Festschrift in Honor of Armin Leutbecher's 80th Birthday (Chapter 7)*, 2016.

[16] J. E. Jones. On the determination of molecular fields II. From the equation of state of a gas. *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A*, 106:463, 1924.

[17] K. Kasamatsu, M. Tsubota, and M. Ueda. Vortices in Multicomponent Bose-Einstein Condensates. *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 19(11):1835–1904, 2005.

[18] A. Mogilner, L. Edelstein-Keshet, L. Bent, and A. Spiros. Mutual interactions, potentials, and individual distance in a social aggregation. *J. Math. Biol.*, 47(4):353–389, 2003.

[19] H. L. Montgomery. Minimal Theta Functions. *Glasgow Mathematical Journal*, 30, 1988.

[20] E. J. Mueller and T.-L. Ho. Two-Component Bose-Einstein Condensates with a Large Number of Vortices. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(18), 2002.

[21] M. Petrache and S. Serfaty. Next order asymptotics and renormalized energy for riesz interactions. *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu*, FirstView:1–69, 7 2016.

[22] R. A. Rankin. A Minimum Problem for the Epstein Zeta-Function. *Proceedings of The Glasgow Mathematical Association*, 1:149–158, 1953.

[23] N. Rougerie and S. Serfaty. Higher dimensional coulomb gases and renormalized energy functionals. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 2015.

[24] L. Samaj and E. Trizac. Critical phenomena and phase sequence in a classical bilayer wigner crystal at zero temperature. *Physical Review B*, 85(20), 2012.

[25] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty. From the Ginzburg-Landau Model to Vortex Lattice Problems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 313(3):635–743, 2012.

[26] P. Sarnak and A. Strömbergsson. Minima of Epstein's Zeta Function and Heights of Flat Tori. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 165:115–151, 2006.

[27] F. Theil. A Proof of Crystallization in Two Dimensions. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 262(1):209–236, 2006.

[28] P. Zhang. On the Minimizer of Renormalized Energy related to Ginzburg-Landau Model. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, (available online), January 2015.